

**Minutes**  
**MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE**  
CITY OF ROSEVILLE CIVIC CENTER  
311 Vernon Street, Meeting Rooms 1 & 2  
**August 3, 2004 – 7:00 p.m.**

---

The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee was called to order on Tuesday, August 3, 2004, 7:00 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center.

**SILENT ROLL CALL**

The following Committee members were present: Clair Alway, David Benedetti, Dan Dimick, Grace Keller, Dave Kingsbury, Alan Colombo, Kim Kelley, Mary Lou Pierce, and Mike Isom.

Committee Staff/Consultant Members present: Julia Burrows, Garth Gaylord, Robert Flaner, Ross Berman, and Russell Frandsen

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Welcome by Julia Burrows, Roseville City Manager's Office. Committee members and staff introduced themselves. Julia Burrows thanked the group for volunteering to participate on the Committee and explained that this Plan is particularly important. The City is under close scrutiny by FEMA because under the Community Rating System, we have the potential to be the first Class 1 city in the country. Roseville is currently a Class 5 city with 1 being the best and 10 being a non-participating agency.

**OVERVIEW of DMA 2000 and COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM**

Robert Flaner of Tetra Tech discussed the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and the Community Rating System (copies of power point presentation as distributed as handouts and attached to these minutes). Highlights of his presentation are as follows:

Disaster Mitigation Act

- Created mandate for communities to become proactive in planning for disasters
- Promote sustainable practices
- Encourage coordination of different levels of planning, ensure state and local entity plans don't contradict each other
- Established new system for obtaining disaster funding. As of November 1, 2004 local mitigation plans must be in place to receive disaster funding
- Created a new Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant program.

Grace Keller asked if there is a booklet for a cost/benefit analysis as to what is best. Robert Flaner responded that FEMA has created a software package for performing a cost-benefit analysis to be used when applying for "project" grants. A full B/C analysis is not a requirement of the plan, but a "review" of benefits vs. costs is. A benefit cost review of initiatives is proposed for the Roseville plan.

Fiction regarding the Stafford Act and Funds for Hazard Mitigation and Disaster Recovery. There are three kinds of assistance for post-disaster recovery:

- Individual Assistance (IA)
- Public Assistance (PA)
- Hazard Mitigation grant pool – 15% by statute, current levels are 71/2% of total eligible funds

This plan is only tied to this third kind of funding. If there was a disaster in Roseville, we would still be eligible for the IA and PA funding. With regards to the November 1, 2004 deadline, FEMA can make regional exceptions in extending the deadline as long as there is a good faith effort by the agency. Roseville will not be done by November 1, 2004 because in order to do it right, will need to take a little longer

- Act made a new definition of “local government”. Any agency that has its own governing board will need to have its own DMA 2000 plan

#### Community Rating System

- Incentive program from the National Flood Insurance Program
  - Work done above and beyond minimum CRS requirements can result in lower flood rates (from 5-45% reductions available)
  - Can receive points in 4 areas (public information, mapping and regulations, flood damage reduction, and flood warning)
- Roseville very progressive in its flood plain management
  - Back in 1988, City was using future flood planning based on future build out projections rather than just current flood plan provided by FEMA. Roseville also included a Safety Element in the 992 Roseville General Plan.
- 10 step CRS planning criteria were the basis for federal required planning under the DMA.
  - 4 categories
    - Planning Process
    - Risk Assessment
    - Mitigation Strategy
    - Plan Maintenance
  - These processes will make the city eligible for two other sources of money – both pre- and post-disaster funding

#### **STEERING COMMITTEE’S ROLE**

Robert Flaner continued his presentation by describing the Steering Committee’s role in the process. He stated that the Committee would provide a helpful perspective and resource for making the plan better. The Committee will test potential ideas and through public outreach, gain public support for the plan.

The City also has a planning team including the City of Roseville staff and Tetra Tech. Tetra Tech will help ensure compliance with CRS and DMA requirements and assist with the drafting of the plan. The City’s second consultant is funded by a FEMA grant – Greenhorne and O’Mara.

Alan Colombo asked, based upon the definition of a local government, should the Dry Creek School District have be doing this as well? Julia Burrows responded that you need to partner with the City or the Placer County. Robert Flaner stated that there are two options – you can go with the city, but you need to do a specific risk assessment applicable to your school.

Alan Colombo commented that the schools couldn’t be nearly as complicated. Robert said that he didn’t think the city would have a problem with adding the Dry Creek School District area to the City’s plan. Dave Kingsbury commented that the Roseville City School District is participating in the Placer County Office of Education plan. Ross Berman commented that the difference is if you go with the county that you continue to be a part of the city and we can make reference to your county plan. Alan Colombo stated that the Dry Creek District is not just in one city; it’s also in Sacramento County. Robert Flaner, Tetra Tech: makes it difficult because our

plan only covers what's actually within the City. We could redefine the city's area to include a bubble outside the area.

Robert Flaner explained that unless you own the facility, you couldn't apply for a hazard mitigation grant that is one of the purposes of preparing the plan. Any district can do the risk assessment, but you need to also go through the process and participate in the development of a plan to comply with the legislation.

Robert Flaner said the primary question is if the District is going to be able to document that you've participated in the process? Dave Kingsbury said that the county already has about 19 districts involved. Robert Flaner said past experience has said he had the problem of agencies wanting to jump on board at the end; however, each entity needs to do a specific number of things. It is probably early enough that you could link up with certain processes already taking place. FEMA is requiring linkage criteria, where if you're going to adopt a plan, then you must follow certain steps.

Garth Gaylord commented that through the CRS system, 2 years ago the City was audited. He explained that for every 500 points you improve one class – at that time best community was a Class 3 in the nation. We could have been a Class 1, but we did not have a flood management plan that met their criteria because we did not follow certain processes. Following the CRS script will allow Roseville to prepare a plan that meets both DMA and CRS requirements and thus provide multiple tangible benefits to the City such as grant eligibility and a further reduction in flood insurance premiums..

Julia Burrows stated that she would call the Placer County Office of Education to determine their status and the inclusion of the four Roseville school districts. Robert Flaner said that it should not be a problem to include an area for the school district, but we would need to consult the plan that covers the other part of the school district and address those plan points as well. One of our requirements is to coordinate with other agencies; other agencies are invited to participate. We could probably ask Placer and Sacramento County to let us know what risk assessments apply to that school district and make a bubble in our plan. The District would just need to have one publicly advertised meeting two weeks prior to plan submittal.

## **MEETING PROCEDURES**

Robert Flaner reviewed the Meeting Procedures (handout) for the Committee. The goal is to have this organized by end of the night. We need to decide how we're going to operate and this document was provided to give some suggestions.

Robert began by describing the Chair's responsibilities and asked if anyone was willing to be a chair? Grace Keller asked what the difference between facilitating a meeting and having a process manager or chair was. Robert Flaner responded by stating that staff does the agendas for you, while the Chair tries to help ensure that the meeting meets the goals and objectives of the agenda. The Chair is also welcome to take a more active role in developing the goals. We need to have a lead point person and a point of control. In addition, if we have media contacts, it would be helpful for the chair to represent the group Chair can be a city employee, but would prefer that the City employees not be the chair. Julia Burrows stated that the Chair would also do the presentations at City Council.

Grace Keller asked if it is possible to have the chair rotate. Robert Flaner, Tetra Tech: would be okay to rotate between chair and vice-chair, but if we rotate amongst the group, defeats the purpose of the Chair as a point of contact.

Robert asked the Committee if they preferred consensus or voting for decision-making. Consensus means you can live with something. Majority means we tally an actual vote. Grace Keller said that with a previous committee what we did was try to really understand the reasons for opposition, which helped improve the quality of the output. We tried to get the point that the person disagreeing would be able to at least agree with the concept.

The Committee agreed on voting versus consensus. Robert stated that the first few voting items were for the Chair and objectives for the plan. Some plans have a guiding vision with initiatives and goals. We want to define what is it that we actually want to do?

Robert stated that we would create a catalog with mitigation measures to give you some ideas about what can be done for each of the different disasters. We want to negotiate something that everyone can live with and we have to look at benefit vs. cost. We have to prioritize our initiatives and look at what's reasonable to be done.

Robert Flaner suggested that we included in the minutes and meeting procedures that the Committee uses the voting process with parameters for discussion opportunities.

Robert called for a vote to elect Grace Keller, who volunteered to chair the Committee as Chair. The nine Committee members present voted unanimously to elect Grace Keller Chair of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee.

Robert Flaner called for a vote on the Vice Chair. Kim Kelley had volunteered to be Vice Chair. All nine Committee members present voted to elect Kim Kelley Vice Chair.

Dan Dimick asked a about meeting attendance and alternates. Julia Burrows stated that if you can't be there, we do ask that you send an alternate. Robert Flaner commented that if attendance will be a problem, please let us know and we will appoint an alternate – they can vote for you and will be included in pre-meeting materials.

**Action Item:** Julia Burrows will include in her next e-mail to the Committee to request the members who may not be able to attend to designate and alternate. The meeting procedures state that if you miss three meetings you will be asked to step down from the Committee and the City will find a replacement. Grace Keller asked what about if you and/or alternate miss 2 meetings consecutively. Robert Flaner said we'd contact those missing 2 and see if they need to be replaced.

Robert Flaner said staff is proposing third Monday night every. The Committee discussed the potential meeting days and starting times. The Committee unanimously agreed that the regular meetings would be the **third Tuesdays from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.** The next meeting will be September 21.

Julia Burrows stated the City will have a location on the website for information. Agendas will be posted and all committee materials will be available there. She also stated that because this is an ad hoc Committee appointed by the Council, the Committee must follow the provisions of the Brown Act. Robert Flaner said we will plan on getting agendas at least one and usually two weeks before meetings.

Julia Burrows will circulate agendas via email and that she has everyone's e-mail now.

**BREAK**

The Committee adjourned at 8:12 p.m. and reconvened at 8:28 p.m.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY**

Robert Flaner asked the Committee if they had any question on expectations? No Committee members raised any issues.

Robert Flaner stated that the Committee needs to discuss the public involvement strategy for preparing the plan. First, the members' selection as part of the committee was a public involvement process. On the work program handout, Phase 1 and 2 are taking place simultaneously. We need to give the committee viable options for hazards. We will give you each a copy of the State of California Draft Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The State plan requirements are different than the local plan, but the City does need to address the hazards in the state plan, in particular the ones that have a probability of occurring here in Roseville.

You have the Hazard list here. We want you to say what you would see as most likely to happen in Roseville. You'll want to look at risk, vulnerability, and probability. We want your help to narrow down this list. Dan Dimick asked if staff wanted a response by next meeting. Staff responded yes. Ross Berman stated that we are going to send out an on-line questionnaire that will help to assess real and assessed risks. By getting the committee's input quicker we can then present those items to the public for their input.

**Action Item:** Julia Burrows will send an e-mail asking members to check boxes for hazards that they think are probable. Robert Flaner stated that you could also put other ones that we didn't think of on that list. For example, a Folsom Lake dam failure could potentially impact Roseville. What we need to see if there has been dam inundation studies to see what their scenarios are for affected areas. To involve the public, want to get their input on perception of risk.

Julia Burrows stated that last year, the City conducted a citywide services survey. Approximately 1500 households allowed the City to keep their e-mail for future on-line surveys. Of this On-Line Citizens' Advisory Panel, about 750 will be e-mailed with a questionnaire to get their input on hazards and emergency preparedness. The e-mail survey will be presented to the committee members and once members sign off on the survey, it will be sent out to the Panel.

Julia Burrows stated that we hope to have the survey data by September 21 and have results to report to the Committee. This will help to give us direction on what hazards to focus on. We're not trying to tell which hazards are most important. We want public input for this. Robert Flaner of Tetra Tech said this hazard list comes from other experiences; anything that comes in will be used. We want to make this hazard list applicable to Roseville.

Mary Lou Pierce said the Fire Department and the CERT program is working on 1-2 hour video segment to help people do personal preparedness. She said that the e-mail survey is valuable because it could also determine how the public would like to receive information regarding emergency preparedness.

Julia Burrows said that in an earlier on-line survey to improve the City's website, when residents surveyed for email services wanted the number 1 response was email notification of disasters.

Robert Flaner asked for input on the public meeting option. He said we want to show the public what is being done. We could do a presentation or open house format. We'll be asking the committee for guidance as to when and how best to include the public. He said we'd also have to decide if the Committee would like to decide on initiatives first or ask the public. One very successful format was an open house with a table for each hazard and the public could ask questions of the staff at the tables. We'll use GIS mapping where someone could see the different map layers for disasters and the ones that might affect them. We'll need to keep discussing what's the best way to involve the public and when?

We will be using the City's website and e-mail to keep others updates as to this process. The materials will be posted on the web, as they are prepared. They'll be links to all the agendas and meeting materials. The Steering Committee can use the website to keep track of needed documents. The draft plans are living documents, so document links envisioned to stay on the website in perpetuity.

### **RISK ASSESSMENT**

Ross Berman gave a brief description of risk assessment. He said there is a four-step process for risk assessment.

1. Identify
2. Profile - Likelihood of disaster/hazard, geographic extent
3. Inventory Assets - Survey the entire group of buildings as well as specific critical structures
4. Determine Vulnerability - what is the vulnerability of each asset from the various hazards?

Once the plan identifies the relative risk of hazards, we will know where to put the majority of our efforts for mitigation. FEMA is looking for a kind of a quantitative analysis for cost measures. For example, does the benefit receive exceed the cost of construction?

Robert Flaner stated the primary tool for risk assessment measurement is mapping. At the next meeting, we'll actually start looking at risk assessments and have some maps for the Committee to review.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

Robert Flaner listed the Action Items for follow-up after tonight's meeting.

1. State of CA Plan - The State plan will be put on CD and sent to each one of you. Staff is not looking for feedback; this is just as a reference for you to see what a plan looks like
2. Hazard Questionnaire - Hazard e-mail to be sent to each Committee member. Members are asked to response by Friday August 13.
3. Meeting Procedures - Meeting Procedures will be edited and sent out with the draft minutes.
4. Alternates - Committee Members are to respond to staff with alternate members. Alternates to be sent all materials as well.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, September 21, 2004 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Location to be determined.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment was given.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Steering Committee adjourned at 8:59 p.m.